

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action of 22 June 2009. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-16 are requested.

The Office Action

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application.

Claims 7, 10 and 12 are objected to due to informalities.

Claims 1 and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimauchi et al. (US 5,661,813) (Shimauchi).

Claims 2-6 and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Shimauchi in view of Snyder et al (US 6,287,328).

Claims 7-12 stand rejected rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Snyder in view of Shimauchi.

The Objections Should be Withdrawn

Claims 7 and 12 stand objected to because, according to the Office Action, the phrase “in response determining that an artifact was detected” in claim 7 appears incorrect. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 7 has been amended to correct the subject informality.

The Office Action states that claim 10 is objected to because it recites a limitation that appears to be in opposition to the invention as claimed in claim 7. With respect to this objection, Applicant respectfully requests a more clear statement as to the position taken in the Office Action. Once the subject objection is clarified, Applicant will more fully address this objection.

The Claims Are Not Anticipated By Or Obvious Over the Applied References

Among other elements, **Claim 1** calls for determining whether an artifact was detected in one of the at least two signals from the correlation vector and the average. Shimauchi, on the other hand, is directed to a method an apparatus for multi-channel acoustic echo cancellation which cancel a room echo that causes howling and presents a psycho-acoustic problem in teleconference system provided with a multi-receive-channel system. In light of the teachings of Shimauchi,

Applicant respectfully submits that Shimauchi does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1 and that **claim 1 and claims 2-6 dependent therefrom** distinguish patentably and unobviously over the references of record.

The foregoing discussion can be applied analogously to independent **claims 7 and 13**. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claim 7 and 13. The remaining claims depend from either claims 7 or 13. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8-12 and 14-16 are patentable over the references of record.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that claims 1-16 distinguish patentably and non-obviously over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. An early indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

If any extensions of time are necessary in connection with this Response E, Applicants hereby petition for such extension. If any fees are due in connection with this Response E, the authorization to charge deposit account 14-1270 for the fees associated therewith is hereby provided.

Respectfully submitted,

/Thomas M. Lundin/

Thomas M. Lundin
Reg. No. 48,979
Philips Intellectual Property and Standards
595 Miner Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44143
T: 440-483-4281
F: 440-483-2452